



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Poor Law, and endorses the scheme put forward by Mr. Charles Booth and Sir Arthur Downes, which rests upon the grouping of unions based on population rather than on the area occupied and varying in method according to urban or rural conditions.

In regard to poor law authority for London, Mr. Drage believes that the unit of area should be coterminous with Greater London, as such an area constitutes an urban population socially interconnected and industrially interdependent. As to the question of the constitution of the central authority for London, he rejects the scheme put forward by the majority of the poor law commission and favors "a transformed Metropolitan Asylums Board." His choice of this body rests on the belief that its nearly fifty years of practicable experience and evolution as a working machine of public assistance make it the logical body to assume the new responsibility.

The book should be of interest to all students of English social conditions. The author's twenty-five years of practical experience, both in the United Kingdom and in other countries, give his conclusions no little value. It will hardly prove of interest to the general American reader. In this connection, however, it should be stated that the author's task was no easy one. The present system of English local self-government truly presents a labyrinth "full of pitfalls to the unwary," especially in the domain of public assistance. The poor law administrator in England is supposed to be acquainted with 350 or 400 statutes, with 5000 judicial decisions interpreting those statutes, and with poor law and local government board orders which if printed with the statutes would cover more than 2500 octavo pages.

FRANK D. WATSON.

Haverford College.

Socialism and Co-operative Enterprises

Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx. By BENEDETTO CROCE. Translated by C. M. MEREDITH. With an introduction by A. D. LINDSAY. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxiii, 188. \$1.25.)

This is a collection of occasional essays and reviews, written by Senatore Croce from 1896 to 1900. They are still worth reading as an interesting commentary and criticism of the theories of Marx by one who, although himself both Hegelian

and socialist, considers that all the Marxian doctrines are in need of revision and that some of them should be abandoned altogether. The translation is excellent and the introduction by Mr. Lindsay is not the least important part of the book.

In discussing historical materialism Croce gives slight attention to the plagiarisms of Professor Loria, but regards Professor Labriola's work as the most satisfactory treatment of the question. Historical materialism, as Labriola implicitly admits, is not a philosophy of history but "some philosophising about history." Indeed, there can be no philosophy of history, in the Hegelian sense, for it is impossible to work up into general concepts the single complex whole in which the historical sequence consists. To divide it into its factors is to destroy it. Historical materialism is not even a new method, as Engels called it, but merely the introduction of new data. Nevertheless, the contribution of Marx to historical method is most vital, as he has called attention to forces previously ignored or underestimated. When Professor Stammler says that historical materialism has proved unable to give us a valid science of society, his criticism is wide of the mark, because this was not its main original object. Both Stammler and Labriola err in thinking that there is an inseparable connection between historical materialism and socialism. In the view of Croce, the study of history cannot do more than to show that "society is now so constituted that socialism is the only possible solution which it contains within itself."

Croce's criticism of the Marxian theory of value is interesting chiefly as illustrating the transition between orthodoxy and extreme revisionism. *Das Kapital*, in Croce's view, is an abstract investigation of capitalistic society, which is an ideal and formal, rather than an actual society, and the concept of labor value cannot be applied to actual society without considerable modification. The law of value has validity in the sphere of Marx's conceptions, not in economic reality. It applies only to the determination of the value of commodities capable of being increased by labor. The equivalence of value with socially necessary labor time is a fact, but a fact which exists in the midst of other facts, that is, opposed, limited and distorted by other facts. It is not a completely dominant fact but neither is it non-existent and merely imaginary.

Croce's refutation of the Marxian law of the fall in the rate of profits is most interesting and conclusive; and in his letters to

Professor Pareto on the "Economic Principle" he strikes a shrewd blow at the foundations of mathematical economics:

The mathematicians have done much for economic science by reviving in it the dignity of abstract analysis, darkened and overwhelmed by the mass of anecdotes of the historical school. But, as it happens, they have also introduced into it the prejudices of their profession, the particular prejudices that mathematicians can take up in relation to economics—which is the science of *man*, of a form of the conscious activity of man—the same attitude it rightly takes up in relation to the empirical natural sciences.

J. E. LEROSSIGNOL.

University of Nebraska.

Was Marx Wrong? A Criticism of Marxism vs. Socialism, by Valdimir G. Simkhovitch. By I. M. Rubinow. Issued by the Members of the Marx Institute of America. (New York: The Coöperative Press. 1914. Pp. 62.)

Amid a storm of invective and abuse heaped on Professor Simkhovitch's head, may be discerned three major criticisms of his book by Dr. Rubinow. The first challenges Simkhovitch's data in regard to the concentration of production; the second, his data in regard to the growth of the middle class; and the third, his optimism concerning the welfare of the masses. This review will be confined to an examination of the statistical data and methods of the two authors.

Simkhovitch's thesis in regard to the first point must be carefully noted. He points out (p. 50): "That a centralization of industry has taken place is an undeniable fact," but contends (p. 51) that "there has been no such far-reaching centralization as the Marxian vision of future economic development presaged." For example, the number of manufacturing establishments in the United States increased in greater proportion than the number of wage-earners between 1890 and 1900.

Rubinow, on the other hand, maintains that concentration has been so great (p. 28) that there is no future for small industry; and shows that the data as to growth of establishments were admitted by the Census Bureau to be unreliable. And then he (p. 21) presents a table of "factories, excluding hand and neighborhood industries," for the years 1900 and 1910 which shows that the number of wage-earners has increased faster than the number of establishments. This table is beside the point, for it is just the persistence of the hand and neighborhood industries that is under